

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 are pending in the application. Claims 1-12 have been rejected and are currently under consideration. Claims 1 and 11 have been amended.

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-9 and 11 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in view of Zhao et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,558,717). The Examiner states, in part:

In regard to the argument that Zhao et al and Koai et al teaches that the insulator under the extension and not on the extension, the Examiner disagrees. “On” is a very broad word and includes “on” the lower side of the extension. Thus, the insulators of Zhao et al and Koai et al are “on” the extensions.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite, in part:

an insulating frame disposed between the chamber and the diffuser, said insulating frame being disposed on an upper side of the extension of the diffuser and extending to the side wall of the chamber.

(Emphasis added.)

Applicant respectfully submits that the Zhao reference cited by the Examiner fails to teach or suggest the claimed device. In particular, the Zhao reference fails to teach or suggest that the insulating frame is disposed on an upper side of the extension, as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, the Examiner’s rejection of claim 1 under § 102(b) is unsupported by the Zhao reference. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and claims 2-10, which depend from claim 1.

Claim 11 has been amended to recite, in part:

an insulating frame disposed between the chamber and the diffuser, said insulating frame being disposed on an upper side of the extension of the diffuser and extending to the side wall of the chamber.

(Emphasis added.)

For at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 1, the Examiner’s rejection of claim 11 under § 102(b) is unsupported. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 11 and claim 12, which depends from claim 11.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 4-9, and 11 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in view of Koai et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,106,625).

Applicant respectfully submits that the Koai reference cited by the Examiner fails to teach or suggest that the insulating frame is disposed on an upper side of the extension, as recited in independent claims 1 and 11.

Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection of claims 1 and 11 under § 102(b) is unsupported by the Koai reference. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 11, and claims 2-10 and 12, which depend from claims 1 and 11, respectively.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 4-6, and 8-13 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in view of Leusink et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,302,057). Applicant assumes that the Examiner intended to refer to claims "8-12" rather than "8-13", as no claim 13 exists in the present application.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite, in part:

a chamber having an inner space and side wall;

...

an insulating frame disposed between the chamber and the diffuser, said insulating frame being disposed on an upper side of the extension of the diffuser and extending to the side wall of the chamber.

(Emphasis added.)

Applicant respectfully submits that the Leusink reference cited by the Examiner fails to teach or suggest the claimed device. In particular, the Leusink references fails to teach or suggest that the insulating frame extends to the side wall of the chamber, as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection of claim 1 under § 102(b) is unsupported by the Leusink reference. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and claims 2-10, which depend from claim 1.

Similarly, Claim 11 has been amended to recite, in part:

a chamber having an inner space and side wall;

...

an insulating frame disposed between the chamber and the diffuser, said insulating frame being disposed on an upper side of the extension of the diffuser and extending to the side wall of the chamber.

(Emphasis added.)

MacPherson Kwok Chen & Heid
LLP
1762 Technology Drive, Suite 226
San Jose, CA 95110
Telephone: (408) 392-9250
Facsimile: (408) 392-9262

For at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 1, Applicant submits that the rejection of claim 11 is unsupported by the Leusink reference and that rejection of claims 11-12 should be withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected claims 3 and 7 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Leusink et al. in view of Zhao et al.

As described above, the Leusink reference fails to teach or suggest that the insulating frame is extends to the side wall of the chamber, as recited in claim 1. The Zhao reference fails to cure this deficiency. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the rejection of claims 3 and 7 is unsupported by the Leusink and Zhao references, and that rejection under § 103 of claims 3 and 7 should be withdrawn.

MacPherson Kwok Chen & Heid
LLP
1762 Technology Drive, Suite 226
San Jose, CA 95110
Telephone: (408) 392-9250
Facsimile: (408) 392-9262

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn and the claims allowed. Should any other action be contemplated by the Examiner, it is respectfully requested that he contacts the undersigned at (408) 392-9250 to discuss the application.

**EXPRESS MAIL LABEL NO.
EV 679 031 516 US**

Respectfully submitted,



Hugh H. Matsubayashi
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 43,779